

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 5 and 6 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 7 and 16 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment cancels and amends in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 7-12 and 16 are now pending in this application.

Request for Entry of After-final Amendment and Reply:

Applicant respectfully requests that this 'after-final' amendment and reply be considered and entered, since it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance, and since it lessens the number of potential issues for appeal (by canceling claims 5 and 6).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101:

In the Office Action, claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Due to the amendment made to claim 16 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion provided in the final Office Action, this rejection has been overcome by amendment.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010614 to Arrowood; and claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrowood. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In the “Response to Arguments” section provided on pages 9 and 10 of the final Office Action, the Examiner addresses three arguments made by Applicant’s representative in the previously-filed response. As to argument (1), the Examiner asserts that the features argued are not recited in the claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, as recited in claim 1 prior to the amendments made herein, there was provided means for searching job offer information registered therein when dispatchable temporary worker information is transmitted from said dispatching terminal, and, if there is job offer information that matches said dispatchable temporary worker information, transmitting said dispatchable temporary worker information to said job offer terminal which has registered the matching job offer information. In other words, when a new dispatchable temporary worker enters the system, by way of dispatchable temporary worker information being transmitted from the dispatching terminal, then the searching means searches the job offer information already registered therein to see if there is a match. Thus, the arguments made in the previously-filed response, in that Arrowood does not teach or suggest checking previous job offer information requests (the claimed “job offer information registered therein”) when a new dispatchable working is registered in the system (the claimed “when dispatchable temporary worker information is transmitted from the dispatching terminal”), were directed to claim features. Please note that Arrowood merely provides a client, a prospective employer, with candidate employees that meet the client’s hiring criteria, and Arrowood does not provide a new dispatchable temporary worker with candidate employers that are already registered in the system and that have jobs that meet the skills of the new dispatchable temporary worker.

However, to expedite prosecution of this application, presently pending independent claims 1, 7 and 16 have each been amended to more explicitly recite the features argued in argument (1), as mentioned above.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1, as well as presently pending independent claims 7 and 16, are patentable over the teachings of Arrowood.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 11, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819